Dodd Reviews A Book on Cuba, P. 4

What the Senate Did Not Explore and the Public Does Not Know About the New Secretary of State, 3-4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 3 JANUARY 23, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The New President and the Senate

On the eve of the inauguration, another kind of inaugural message could be read in the first actions of the Senate. The hold of the right-wing Democrats on the key committees was strengthened and rules reform was shelved by an alliance of the new Democratic leadership with the right wing Republicans. A little, a very little, discreet intervention by the new President would have tipped the scales in favor of rules reform and given his liberal supporters a chance in the party caucus to make committee assigments a little less lopsidedly Southern and conservative. This detachment from urgent tasks of leadership by the incoming President will cost his program dearly.

Victory for Rules Reform Would Have Been Easy

Few realize how easily the motion to shelve rules reform might have been defeated. A shift of two votes would have been enough and there are several combinations which would have yielded them. The vote was 50 to 46, and a tie would have blocked the motion. Two votes easily shifted if pressure had been applied were those of Alaska's Bartlett and Hawaii's Oren Young. Their votes to shelve were plain sell-outs of new States with multi-racial populations; Young in particular voted for every civil rights measure last spring. It is a scandal that the Democrat Oren Young should have voted to shelve when the other Hawaiian Senator, the more conservative and Republican Fong, voted against the motion. There were other combinations which would have converted that 50-46 into 48-48. Wyoming's new Senator, Hickey, was ready to vote against shelving when its other Senator, McGee supposedly a liberal, talked him out of it. Kennedy could have put both into the other column. McGee indeed has a reputation for being a "leadership man" but this only raises the question of whether Lyndon Johnson or Kennedy is doing the leading. Another scandalous vote was that of Chavez; the one Senator of Latin American origin betrayed the Mexican American's struggle for full equality when he voted with the Southerners while his fellow New Mexican, the "Anglo", Anderson, fought for them. Gore said he was for three-fifths cloture but voted to shelve (while the absent Kefauver who would have voted with the liberals was incorrectly listed in the *Record* as paired for shelving). A bit of pressure might have swung Chavez or Gore over, and indeed changed the vote of the new majority leader himself. For the wavering Mansfield has said that he would be for three-fifths cloture if it came to a vote. The motion to shelve could have been defeated and three-fifths cloture enacted if Kennedy who was kept apprised, had applied pressure. Or could it be true, as Smathers of Florida is reported to have told certain Senators, that Kennedy favored shelving of the rules fight?

The Monster We Can No Longer Control

President Eisenhower's farewell, with its eloquent warning against the dangers of a huge military machine and armaments industry, came too late for this issue. We pause only to note that it was foreshadowed in his earlier State of the Union message when he said, "The 'bomber gap' of several years ago was always a fiction, and the 'missile' gap shows every sign of being the same." We wonder whether a civilian president, without Mr. Eisenhower's prestige as a military commander, will dare challenge myths of this kind. Mr. Eisenhower himself was never effectively able to combat these high pressure public relations scare campaigns designed to serve arms manufacturers hungry for orders. From a military view these "gaps" were folly; the billions spent on obsolete bombers put the U.S. behind the U.S.S.R. in the race for the ICBM. How is the ordinary citizen to know the truth when it takes time even for a military man as President to see behind bloated intelligence estimates?

Had a motion to shelve been defeated, three-fifths cloture could have been enacted by majority vote so long as Nixon was still in the chair. This would have given the outgoing Vice President a final moment of glory. The Republican leadership could easily have given Nixon this victory. The Republicans were split, 18 for shelving and 16 against it. Javits, who led the battle for the Republican liberals, was surprised by the defection of Saltonstall, a co-sponsor of majority cloture, and by Miller of Iowa who had given a commitment to vote the other way. These two votes could easily have been changed, and would have changed the outcome. But it would have given the Nixon liberal wing predominance over the Goldwater conservative wing of the party, and what Clark of Pennsylvania termed the "Goldwater Democrats" allied themselves with the Goldwater Republicans to ensure conservative control of the Senate.

This was a sour first sally at the New Frontier. But what happened in the privacy of the Democratic caucus was worse than what happened in the full daylight of the Senate floor. There Senator Clark fought an unrewarding battle to give supporters of the Kennedy program better vantage points in the key committees. His first objective was to expand and change the steering committee but while he was named one of three new members, the other two were Williams of Delaware and Dodd of Connecticut, the former a colorless and the latter a fanatical right-winger, both closely allied to the dominant Southern conservatives who still fill 7 of the 16 members of the steering committee. Clark's next objective was to expand and liberalize the Judiciary and Finance Committees. He failed in both; indeed in the case of Judiciary,

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rusk Hearing: What Senate Foreign Relations Committee Did Not Explore . . .

The hearing given Dean Rusk by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee differed only in minor essentials from a typical State Department press conference. Mr. Rusk is abler, more cultured and subtler than the usual State Department spokesman but these qualities only added a certain aesthetic pleasure in gamesmanship to his deft evasions. Most members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are not as well informed as the average State Department reporter and their questions were clumsier. But by and large the performance was the usual departmental exercise in telling the press and public as little as possible. The only difference is that whereas on ordinary occasions this leaves the press frustrated, on this occasion it left a general glow of satisfaction. This was attributable in part to the relief that Mr. Rusk had succeeded in evading the taking of any frozen positions, to the absence of moralizing in the Dulles style and to an eloquent passage on the acceptability of neutralism. Above all it was reassuring to hear him back away from the position he took in the April 1960 issue of *Foreign Affairs* warning (on the eve of the Paris meeting) against the dangers of summitry. While admitting that he had "as a private citizen, expressed some concern," he now thinks "it would be improper to generalize about an issue of this sort."

Is Senate Scrutiny to Become Empty Ritual?

A new Secretary of State, facing complex negotiations, cannot show his hand in advance. But the constitutional requirement of Senate confirmation becomes an empty ritual if the hearing on the nomination produces only platitudes. The Senate's vote to confirm ought to be based on something more than wishful thinking, deference to the President, partisan considerations or a feeling of what's-the-use. There are questions in between the too specific and the too general on which a nominee may properly be asked to express his opinions. One example which comes to mind is Mr. Rusk's answer to Senator Wiley's request for his views on Latin American policy. Mr. Rusk's lengthy reply was in sonorous but opaque Foundation prose, and ended by recommending "more alertness as to what they [the Latin Americans] are doing in the cultured world." Mr. Rusk might well have been asked his views on such grimier hemispheric problems as land reform and the virtual State Dept. embargo on loans for public development of basic resources. No incandescent sympathy for the hungry millions to the south of us shone through his smooth truisms yet the future of the hemisphere depends on our ability to break away from conventional diplomatic postures. I was sorry that Senator Mansfield, who showed in a speech several months ago that he views black Africa's problems freshly (see the *Weekly* of last Sept. 5) did not press Mr. Rusk beyond pleasant generalities about neutralism to the more specific question of insulating Africa from the Great Power struggle.

A striking instance of the Committee's ineffectuality was the way in which Senator Aiken (R.Vt.) handled assertions about Mr. Rusk in our newsletter of December 19. Readers may see for themselves in the boxes accompanying this story exactly what we said and the questioning to which it gave rise. It is extraordinary that a political sensation as great as that caused by Mr. Rusk's speech in May, 1951, on China policy should pass with so little notice on the occasion of his return to the State Department as Secretary. A joint Senate committee under Senator Russell was investigating the recall of MacArthur by Truman; Generals Marshall and Bradley were explaining, in the latter's memorable phrase, that the Korean conflict was the wrong war at the wrong time and the wrong place, that the Korean peninsula—doorway to nowhere—was a dangerously foolish area in which to pin down a major portion of U.S. military power. From this sprang the logic of limiting the war and negotiating peace with the Chinese Communists once South Korea had been cleared of its invaders.

In the middle of this national debate, with the Truman administration besieged, Henry Luce arranged a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria on May 18, 1951, under the auspices of the China Institute and invited Dulles, Rusk and Senator Douglas—who was then supporting MacArthur against Truman—to

On Rusk's Financial Ties

Sen. AIKEN: One other thing: This newsletter as I say is not very complimentary to you. It states here: 'His appointment'— and I am quoting—'his appointment means that the Rockefeller, Chase Manhattan, Standard Oil family, oriented toward a strong Germany and a tough colonial policy, will have a friendly ear in the topmost job of the Cabinet.'

Did I understand you to say that you have divested yourself of securities in corporations?

Mr. RUSK: I have never held securities in corporations.

* * *

The CHAIRMAN (Fulbright): Mr. Rusk, do you have any private interests that would possibly constitute a conflict of interest situation regarding this assignment?

Mr. RUSK: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. I have resigned as President of the Rockefeller Foundation to sever all ties of any sort with the Foundation, which will be effective before I would assume office. I have no stocks or bonds of any corporate or other private enterprise which would produce any problem there. At the time of the termination of my service with the Rockefeller Foundation, the trustees of the Foundation expect to enter into a trust agreement with the Chase National [sic] Bank to provide severance pay for my services, which will involve payments over a period of years under that trust agreement.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jan. 12.

"The salary of the president of the Rockefeller Foundation is held in strict confidence, trustees and officers of the Foundation said last night. It is rumored to be between $50,000 and $75,000 a year."

—New York Times, Dec. 13, "Post Costs Rusk Big Cut in Salary," on appointment as Secretary of State.

Necrology

We pause to pay tribute to our friend Howard Watson Ambruster who has just died in New Jersey at 82. He was a chemical engineer who devoted his life to the fight for the pure food and drug laws and against the international chemical trust. His major work, "Treason's Peace," tells the story of I.G. Farben's relations with Standard Oil before the war in a business conspiracy which became a weapon of economic warfare in the hands of Hitler. Mr. Armbruster was a brave, a tireless and a devoted man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . And Public Does Not Know About Man Kennedy Chose as Sec'y. of State

speak. Mr. Dulles was in the department as a token of bipartisanship; his rank was Ambassador and his assignment was the Japanese peace treaty. The trio went down the MacArthur line. Mr. Rusk as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs made a speech which was haled by *Time, Life,* David Lawrence, Senator Taft and the rightist *Washington Times-Herald* as a reversal of our China policy and the adoption of MacArthur's views. Mr. Rusk called Communist China, in a phrase deserving of a place in the footnotes of history as a memorably colossal misconception, "a Slavic Manchukuo." He asserted that the Kuomintang alone represented the Chinese people, called on them to rise and declared that under no circumstances would we deal with Peking. This implied unlimited war against China and undercut the Administration's position. The *Washington Post* (May 22) reported that Rusk "did not consult in advance with his own Department" that the reactions at the Pentagon were "sulphurous" and that Acheson was "hopping mad", as well he might be because the speech was orchestrated with an uproar in Congress where 43 Republican Congressmen and even Democrats like Gore and House Party Whip Percy Priest demanded his resignation, while McCarthy attacked him and a "treacherous Red clique" in the State Department.*

The British Ambassador protested to the State Department that the Rusk speech, if it represented policy, would make it impossible to negotiate peace in Korea. Walter Lippman, Lowell Mellett, Marquis Childs and even Arthur Krock wrote critical columns. Secretary Acheson held a press conference May 23 in which he denied any change in policy had occurred, admitted that Mr. Rusk's choice of words may have been unfortunate and cut off questions when they became too sharp. Had Rusk been discharged he would have become the hero of the China lobby; as it was he was quietly smothered. Six months later a story from Washington in the *New York Times* (Nov. 30, 1951) said Rusk was "expected to resign soon to take a position with private enterprise." In December when the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation met they voted to make Rusk president on Chester Barnard's retirement the following June. Dulles was then Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation and I can state with assurance on the basis of private information that he got Mr. Rusk the job, reported (see box on page 2) to pay from $50,000 to $75,000 a year. This was not too bad a consolation prize.

*** Life in an editorial May 28, 1951, praising the Rusk speech as a "Great reversal of policy in Asia" concluded coyly, "Anyone is bound to wonder whether a Secretary of State with his [Acheson's] past can effectively apply the policy spelled out last week." Did Luce and Dulles hold out the hope to Rusk of stepping into Acheson's shoes?**

What the Weekly Said of Rusk

"Mr. Rusk was not quite the colorless State Dept. character he is cracked up to be. He became the hero of the China lobby and the MacArthurites in 1951 as Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs and left the State Department after his relations with Secretary Acheson became strained. He went to the Rockefeller Foundation and participated in the preparation of the Rockefeller reports which advocated a stepped up arms race behind a smokescreen of diffuse liberalism. His appointment means that the Rockefeller-Chase Manhattan-Standard Oil family, oriented toward a strong Germany and a tough colonial policy, will have a friendly ear in the topmost job of the Cabinet."

—I. F. Stone's Weekly, Dec. 19, 1960.

What Time Tactfully Left Out

In a cover story on Rusk last December 26, *Time* quoted the 1951 speech with approval but said nothing of the storm it had stirred up. So did David Lawrence's *U.S. News & World Report* of the same date. Who would have dreamt in 1951 that the ambitious but incautious young Assistant Secretary of State who made himself persona non grata with the Truman Administration by playing ball in this way with its political enemies would turn up in a new Democratic Administration as Secretary of State? To be able to keep all this so well hidden from the view of the Senate and the public, and perhaps Kennedy himself, is quite a feat.

A question from Chairman Fulbright elicited the information that Mr. Rusk is drawing some kind of annual payment from Chase Manhattan, the bank of the Rockefeller family and Standard Oil, as "severance pay" for his eight years as president of the Rockefeller Foundation. The Rockefellers through their holdings in Katanga have a direct interest in the Congo problem; Standard Oil of New Jersey, which draws a major portion of its income from Venezuela, has a similar stake in Latin American policy. These are but two instances of this imperial family's world-wide interests. I did not know of the special trust fund when I wrote in December but I do not believe I exaggerated when I said the Rusk appointment would give these interests "a friendly ear in the topmost job of the Cabinet." It is a strange kind of prudery about moneyed interests that shields such matters from exploration by Senate committees and leaves the public unaware of their existence.

Text of Dean Rusk's Denial of Strained Relations With Acheson in 1951 Over China Policy

Sen. AIKEN (R. Vt.): Mr. Rusk, I have recently been handed a certain newsletter which does not give you a very high rating for the job to which you are being appointed. According to this newsletter you and Secretary Acheson had some difficulties in 1951, Secretary Acheson felt we could deal with the Red Chinese government and reach a settlement with them, that you held that the Red Chinese government did not represent the Chinese people and that we couldn't do business with them, and this document says you, and I quote, 'left the State Department after his relations with Secretary Acheson became strained.'

Is that an accurate summary of the situation which prevailed at that time?

Mr. [Dean] RUSK: Not at all, sir. That is completely inaccurate.

Sen. AIKEN: Did you hold—

Mr. RUSK: When I was serving with Secretary Acheson we worked together on all lines of policy, and there was never the division referred to on any of these major questions; and I left the Department of State under the most amicable relations with Secretary Acheson, and he and I have remained warm and close friends ever since.

Sen. AIKEN: Very well.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jan. 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Clark Reveals How Wilson Cleared the Way for His New Freedom Program

(Continued from Page One)

two liberal aspirants, Burdick of North Dakota and Young of Ohio, though they had seniority were passed over for Blakley of Texas and Young of Missouri, just as Clark himself, though he had seniority, was passed over for Dodd in filling a vacancy on Foreign Relations. The sacred rule of seniority seems to be waived for conservatives.

Eastland and Byrd Guard the Vital Passes

The result as Clark protested on the Senate floor is that Judiciary will be controlled by a majority opposed to civil rights and Finance by a majority opposed "to tax reform, to closing tax loopholes, and to medical care for the aged under Social Security." These majorities, as Clark said, "are against the program of the President-elect and they are proud of it." The political dynamism of the new Administration depends on civil rights; its economic dynamism on creative use of fiscal powers. Eastland and his allies are in a position to block the first; Byrd and his, to block the second. This is the inaugural message spelt out in the realities of the Senate.

It is not often that a Senator engages in original historical research. Clark did in this battle. Lyndon Johnson's right hand man, Bobby Baker, secretary to the majority, ruled that the records of past Senate caucuses were open to examination by Senators only, not by their staffs. Clark went into the fading records on his own and reported a striking story to the Senate. He said that on the eve of the New Freedom, when Wilson took office in 1913, a revolt in the Democratic caucus expelled some 28 ranking Democrats from committee chairmanships and replaced them with newer progressive Senators pledged to support Wilson's program. The result was enactment within a few months of a sweeping reform program. George H. Haynes, in his history of the Senate, says this shakeup took place "after a long conference with President Wilson." The revitalized steering committee reported to the caucus "We propose that this great body shall be democratic not only in name but in practical reality and that the charge so often made that it is controlled by a few men through committee organization and otherwise shall no longer have any basis in fact." These are the dangerous words and the inspiring example Baker kept safely locked away in the old records. A pity they were kept from Kennedy, too.

Senator Dodd Had Better Subpoena These Rival Book Reviewers

"A solid, carefully documented yet dramatic work that tells the story of Castro's rise to power and of the manner in which he was abetted by naive American sentimentalists, deluded liberals and open philo-Communists."

—Senator Dodd on Nathaniel Weyl's "Red Star Over Cuba," p. A173 Congressional Record Jan. 11.

"Although the book's jacket proclaims that Mr. Weyl 'knows his Latin America,' his work suggests that he not only lacks any first hand knowledge of the Cuban revolution . . . but that he is equally unaware of the political realities of Latin America. . . . Much of the information presented here, painting the Cuban revolution as a deliberately Communist undertaking, is based on such sources as . . . articles in the newspaper of Dominican Republic's Dictator Rafael Trujillo, files of the Batista political police. . . ."

—Tad Szulc, Latin American correspondent of the New York Times, reviewing Weyl's "Red Star Over Cuba," Sunday, Jan. 15.

" 'Red Star Over Cuba' is basically the perennial post-World War II argument about who 'sold' this or that country to the Communists. . . . Mr. Weyl's chief villains are the State Department . . . and the American press. . . . The result is a picture of devilishly clever and well organized Communist schemers. . . . It's a neat explanation, but a dangerously illusory one. . . . Many of the 'proofs' of all this however, are highly questionable, such as reports from the secret police files of former Latin American dictators . . . the faith that can be extended Mr. Weyl is reduced by his errors in facts that are easily checkable, such as confusion of Cuban economic czar 'Che' Guevara with quite another man and a wildly wrong identification of the archbishop who once saved Fidel's life."

—Review in the Wall St. Journal Jan. 4 by its Havana correspondent, James N. Wallace, whom the Cuban government has just expelled in a move this Weekly deplores.

Holiday Gift Rates Remain in Effect Only Until Next Week—Act Now for Late Shopping

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

1/23/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED